Attorney Docket No.: 25237-12891

Client Ref No: 138.00 US

USSN: 10/765,773

**REMARKS** 

**Introductory Comments**:

Claims 4-8, 11, 12, and 17-20 were examined in the Office Action dated October 4, 2007.

Claims 4-8, 11, 12, and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as

allegedly being indefinite.

Claims 4-8, 11, 12, and 17-20 were rejected under the nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatenable over U.S. Patent no. 7,105,308 in view of US Patent No.

6,365,362.

Claims 4-8, 11, 12, and 17-20 were rejected under the nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatenable over U.S. Patent no. 7,135,300 in view of US Patent No.

6,365,362.

SUPPORT FOR AMENDMENTS

Claim 4 has been amended to recite that the cell surface antigen is in the protein-protein

complex. The amendment finds support throughout the specification, such as, for example, the

claims as originally filed.

Accordingly, no new matter has been added by way of this amendment and the entry

thereof is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS OF THE CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claims 4-8, 11, 12, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §1112, second

paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite because it was said to be not clear if the cell surface

antigen is one of the proteins in the protein-protein complex. The applicants have amended

5

Attorney Docket No.: 25237-12891

Client Ref No: 138.00 US

USSN: 10/765,773

claim 4 to recite that the antigen is on one of the proteins in the protein-protein complex. The

Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

**OBIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING** 

(a) The Examiner rejected claims 4-8, 11, 12, and 17-20 under the nonstatutory

obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatenable over U.S. Patent No. 7,105,308 in view

of US Patent No. 6,365,362. The applicants are attaching a terminal disclaimer over the U.S.

Patent No. 7,105,308. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the

rejection.

(b) The Examiner rejected claims 4-8, 11, 12, and 17-20 under the nonstatutory

obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatenable over U.S. Patent No. 7,135,300 in view

of US Patent No. 6,365,362. The applicants are attaching a terminal disclaimer over the U.S.

Patent No. 7,135,300. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the

rejection.

6

Attorney Docket No.: 25237-12891

Client Ref No: 138.00 US USSN: 10/765,773

**CONCLUSION** 

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims define an invention that is patentable over

the art, and a notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any questions

concerning this Response, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' representative at

(650) 335-7818.

Respectfully submitted,

Kirakossian et al.

Dated: March 4, 2008

By: /Narinder Banait/

Narinder S. Banait, Reg. No.: 43,482

Fenwick & West LLP Silicon Valley Center

801 California Street

Mountain View, CA 94041

Tel.: (650) 335-7818

Fax.: (650) 938-5200

7